



NATIONAL CADET ADVISORY COUNCIL
CIVIL AIR PATROL
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AUXILIARY
105 S. HANSELL ST, BLDG 714
MAXWELL AFB AL 36112-6332

05 December 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR NATIONAL CADET ADVISORY COUNCIL

FROM: Chair

SUBJECT: Minutes of 04 Dec 2005

1. Roll Call

Chair	C/Lt Col Thomas Rehman
NER	C/Capt Sam Imbriale, Representative
GLR	C/Lt Col Robert Koehler, Representative
NCR	C/Lt Col Ryan Kenny, Representative
RMR	C/Maj Robert Ball, Representative
SWR	C/Lt Col Jamie Hurley, Representative
MER	Not Present
SER	Not Present
PCR	Not Present
Senior	Not Present
NHQ	Mr. Curt LaFond

2. The meeting was called to order at 2105 Eastern Standard Time by the Chair.

3. Reports

- a. Reports were omitted by oversight from the meeting. Important report information is being emailed out over the NCAC mailing list if necessary.

4. New Business

National CAC Review of Draft CAPR 52-16 (Chair)

- a. The Chair has directed each region to prepare their commentary and email it to the NCAC mailing list. Mr. LaFond requires commentary on the new CAPR 52-16 by no later than 08 Jan 2006, which is also the next meeting of the NCAC.

The regulation and rationale for changes can be found at:

http://level2.cap.gov/visitors/member_services/publications/regulations_for_ratification.cfm

Representatives should prepare and mail out their commentary, responding to each of the points in the "Summary and Rationale" along with any other issues at hand, by no later than 28 December 2005. A final copy of the council's commentary will be prepared by the Chair and released by no later than 03 Jan 2006. The council will vote to approve or reject the commentary electronically, by no later than 06 Jan 2006.

5. Old Business

Electronic Voting Results

- a. The memo on the Unit Retesting Issue passed by a vote of 4 - 0 in favor.
- b. The position paper on the Challenge Option in the new 52-16 passed by a vote of 4 - 0 in favor.

Recruiting Goal (CAP/CC)

- c. The Chair of the Recruiting Committee was unavailable to present a report at the meeting. However, C/Lt Col Koehler presented a brief summary on his behalf. The committee decided that the National Commander's goal of each cadet recruiting another cadet is not feasible at the moment.

However, they are looking at ways to improve the program with respect to retention before time is spent on recruiting. The committee chair has not presented a final proposal to the committee yet.

Increase Mitchell Cadet Percentages (NHQ)

- d. The Chair of the Mitchell Cadet Percentages Committee, C/Lt Col Koehler, presented a memo to the council regarding this issue. This can be found in Atch 1. NER (C/Capt Imbriale) motioned for a position paper to be presented to NHQ based on the information in the memo; SWR (C/Lt Col Hurley) seconded. The motion passed unopposed. C/Lt Col Koehler stated that he will prepare a paper prior to the January meeting.

Retaining 16 - 17 Year Old Cadets (NHQ)

- e. National Headquarters requested that the CAC deliberate on how the program could best retain new cadets who are 16 and older. While cadets who join at younger ages do not leave in large amounts at the ages of 16 and older, those who join at these ages often leave the program shortly thereafter.

C/Capt Imbriale stated that he believed the problem largely goes back to the local unit level, rather than any program-wide policy. It was suggested that a survey could be conducted to find out exactly what older cadets who join the program are looking for, so that local curriculums could be tailored to suit this.

Some discussion was held on the merits and problems with the suggested Challenge Option ideas; C/Lt Col Koehler pointed out that the discussion on the Challenge Option had been had already, and a paper had been developed and passed on.

C/Lt Col Rehman and C/Lt Col Koehler suggested that perhaps an advanced aerospace curriculum could be developed for older cadets, to help make the program more challenging. C/Lt Col Hurley pointed out that establishing a much harder standard for the 16 year old cadets could have a negative effect on retention. C/Capt Imbriale agreed, as did C/Lt Col Rehman.

C/Maj Ball suggested that the "honors program" should be entirely optional, for cadets of any age. C/Capt Imbriale asked if yet another optional program would do anything to resolve the program, or if it would just be expended effort. C/Lt Col Rehman noted again that it seems to be a local issue.

C/Capt Imbriale repeated his suggestion about conducting a survey and trying to develop a curriculum that would assist in retaining older, new cadets. He gave the example of a local unit in his region which had recently gotten to go on "room-clearing exercises" with the local ANG Security Forces unit. While activities of that sort may be out of the reach of some units, the only way to retain teenagers was to offer cool "adventuring" and "military" activities that make CAP unique.

NER (C/Capt Imbriale) motioned to have the council gather information from their Region CACs regarding what older cadets join CAP for and want from CAP. RMR (C/Maj Ball) seconded. The motion passed unopposed.

CAC Service at Multiple Echelons (Chair)

- f. C/Lt Col Rehman gave a brief summary of the issue. It was suggested originally that perhaps there should be a regulatory prohibition against serving on more than one CAC at a time; for instance, a Wing Chair also being a Region Representative.

Arguments in favor of this prohibition include reinforcing that CACs do not answer to one another, and preventing the quality of work at one echelon from being affected by work at another.

Arguments against the prohibition included the fact that it would prevent the establishment of clear lines of communication between CACs, and that some areas may not have enough people to separate the two jobs.

The council saw no reason to add a regulatory prohibition at this time. SWR (C/Lt Col Hurley) motioned to dismiss the issue. NER (C/Capt Imbriale) seconded. The motion passed unopposed.

NCSA Service Issue (Chair)

- g. C/Lt Col Rehman gave a brief summary of the issue at hand. It was originally suggested that cadets should be prevented from attending more than two selective activities in a single year of NCSAs. A “selective activity” was defined as an activity in which the number of applicants exceeded the number of slots for that activity.

Mr. LaFond gave a brief overview on how NCSA selection worked at NHQ. He pointed out that if every top-rated cadet from each Wing put E-Tech (Ohio) in as their first choice, not all of them could go, because E-Tech (Ohio) only has 24 slots. Every year they have 2400 applications and only 1200 slots, so there are always people who are turned away.

C/Lt Col Koehler stated that he believed that the continuity of how wings select individuals for NCSAs could be improved, but he saw no policy issue at the national level. C/Lt Col Hurley strongly echoed the sentiments for standardizing the wing-level review process. C/Lt Col Rehman pointed out the difficulty in standardizing things over very different wings.

SWR (C/Lt Col Hurley) motioned to dismiss the issue. GLR (C/Lt Col Koehler) seconded the motion. The motion passed unopposed.

Shoulder Cord Wear (NER)

- h. C/Capt Imbriale will be emailing Susie Parker at NHQ on behalf of the council in order to inquire as to the wear of the cord on the short-sleeve and long-sleeve blue shirt. He proposed that the cord should be worn on the button when worn with the shirt, and worn at the seam when worn in the service dress. The council voiced their agreement to this. C/Capt Imbriale will report back on what he learns.

6. Open Floor

- a. Mr. LaFond had two items. First, he explained that the Training Leaders for Cadets (TLC) curriculum was available online and invited the representatives to examine it. He also urged everyone who was interested in NCSAs to be sure they finished their applications in time.
- b. C/Lt Col Rehman stated that he would be posting information regarding Vice Chair elections shortly. The position should be filled by the January or February teleconference.
- c. C/Lt Col Koehler brought up an issue from his Region CAC regarding a potential error in some leadership tests. Mr. LaFond stated that a new set of tests would be coming out in a month or two.

7. The next meeting will be held on 08 January 2006 at 2100 Eastern Standard Time.

8. GLR (C/Lt Col Koehler) motioned to adjourn. NCR (C/Lt Col Kenny) seconded. The motion carried unopposed. The Chair adjourned the meeting at 2202 Eastern.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS A. REHMAN, C/Lt Col, CAP
Chair
National Cadet Advisory Council

Attachments:

1. Memo "Increasing Mitchell Cadet Percentages"

Distribution:

- 1 - Representatives
- 1 - CAP/CC
- 1 - Senior Advisor
- 1 - NHQ Advisor
- 1 - File / Yahoogroups

Attachment 1 Cover Sheet

Memorandum from C/Lt Col Robert Koehler, Chair of the Mitchell Cadet Percentages Committee



NATIONAL CADET ADVISORY COUNCIL
CIVIL AIR PATROL
UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AUXILIARY
105 S. HANSELL ST, BLDG 714
MAXWELL AFB AL 36112-6332

3 December 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR NATIONAL CADET ADVISORY COUNCIL

FROM: Chair, Mitchell Cadet Percentages Committee

SUBJECT: Increasing Mitchell Cadet Percentages

1. According to the information given to this council, only 16 percent of all cadets achieve the Mitchell Award. It was asked that we investigate ways to increase this percentage nation wide. When investigating this issue we found a number of factors that affect this percentage, but by far it was agreed that the retention and training of new cadets was the core cause of the low percentage of cadets earning the Mitchell Award. It was also found that providing motivation and activities for older cadets was an issue that needed to be addressed.
2. In addition to the information from national, I requested information from a number of wings and received the following information. Wisconsin Wing has 372 cadets of which 68 cadets have earned the Mitchell Award. This is approximately 18.3%. Michigan Wing's percentage of Mitchell cadets averages between 28-43% of cadets per squadron, with a Wing average of 31%. Unfortunately I did not receive responses from enough wings to present a significant cross sample. Before pushing this issue any further I think we should have that information gathered to give an idea of not only how many cadets earn their Mitchell award, like the information presented by national, but what percentage of current cadets are cadet officers.
3. In addressing the problem of how to increase Mitchell cadet percentages numerous ideas were brought up, but most faced a majority opposition. These included:
 - a. Requiring the Mitchell Award to attend NCSA's.
 - b. Requiring Wing CAC's to be composed of only officers.
 - c. Requiring cadets to go through additional required activities.
4. The overall solution to the percentage of cadets earning their Mitchell Award is for us to do a better job of getting newer members involved and providing them with motivation to advance in the program. This is something that National, Wings, and especially squadrons need to focus on. By getting these cadets involved they will be exposed to more of the program, which will motivate them to continue and advance in the program. Also by providing a strong foundation of newer cadets the need will arise for qualified cadet staff to train them. This will build some competition between cadets who desire to be on staff, pushing them to advance in the program.
5. We believe that by increasing the retention and involvement of these newer cadets along with some more focus on what experiences and incentives become available when you earn your Mitchell will increase the national percentage of cadets earning their Mitchell award. Some things that can be done with this idea include:
 - a. Availability/Implementation of Airmen and/or NCO Schools in more Wings.
 - b. Encouraging squadrons to put new cadets through a basic cadet training program when feasible.
 - c. Providing and advertising more national, wing, and squadron activities in which newer cadets could participate.
 - d. Emphasizing the desire for cadet officers for staff positions at wing encampments
 - e. Providing more advertisement of COS and IACE to NCOs and new cadets.
 - f. Reminding NCOs that to apply for college scholarships you must have earned your Mitchell.
6. An item which we feel that needs to be addressed is the problem of numerous cadets who are known to have remained NCOs for the sole purpose of being able to continue to participate in the National Color Guard Competition. We propose that cadet officers be allowed to participate in the National Color Guard Competition and that we restrict a cadet NCOs participation in the National Competition to only one year as a NCO. But by allowing cadet officers to participate in the National Color Guard Competition, it could become dominated by cadet officers,

blocking the participation of those newer to the program. Because of this we recommend that cadets only be allowed to participate in the National Color Guard Competition a total of two times of which only one time could be as a cadet NCO.

7. Unfortunately we have found no National policy which could be created that would truly fix this problem. The thing that will actually have an effect on the percentage of cadets earning their Mitchell Award is the local implementation of the program, the opportunities to get involved presented to them, and the quality of senior leadership that is provided to the cadets.

For the Committee,

ROBERT P. KOEHLER, C/Lt Col, CAP
Chair, Mitchell Cadet Percentages Committee
National Cadet Advisory Council